

### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5 and 7 to 29 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 24 and 29 are independent.<sup>1</sup> Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1 to 5, 7, 8, 17 to 21 and 24 to 28 were rejected over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0138331 (Hosea) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0123334 (Borger); claims 9 to 11 and 13 to 16 were rejected over Hosea and Borger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,803 (Massena); and claims 22, 23 and 29 were rejected over Hosea and Borger in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0083123 (Freedman). As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention with greater particularity. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim 1 defines a computer-implemented method that comprises scanning content of a source page in which a component is to be inserted, where the source page is expressed in mark-up code, and where scanning comprises scanning the mark-up code and attributes associated with components defined using the mark-up code in order to obtain information relating to a style of the source page as a whole. The method also includes obtaining a profile based on the information obtained as a result of scanning the content of the source page, where the profile identifies a style of the source page. The method also includes generating a content component that is to be included in the source page in accordance with the profile. Generating includes formatting the content component in accordance with the profile so that a style of the content component comports substantially to a style of the source page.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner is urged to independently confirm this recitation of pending claims.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1, particularly with respect to scanning mark-up code and attributes associated with components defined in the mark-up code in order to obtain information relating to a style of a source page as a whole, and using that information to obtain a profile for formatting content.

As previously noted, Hosea is directed to a method of personalizing Web pages comprised of content components. Hosea's method personalizes Web pages in accordance with a user's profile and in accordance with the profile of an HTML file for the Web page. In particular, the user and HTML profiles are used to arrange content on a Web page that may be of particular interest to the user as described, e.g., in paragraphs 0046 and 0051 of Hosea. The user's profile includes demographic and psychographic information relating to the user (paragraph 0013). The HTML file profile includes ratings assigned to content components of the HTML page (paragraph 0043). In particular, as explained in paragraph 0043,

A profile includes classifications for the content components of the HTML file for the requested Web page. The profile of the HTML file for the requested Web page is based on the same or a similar content classification scheme to the user profiles. An HTML file is formed of constituent components that include content components and formatting components, i.e., the HTML "mark-up." The content components include but are not limited to text, images, advertisements and links to other Web pages. By way of example, a content component can comprise the hyperlinked subject heading "Arts & Humanities" 21. The profile of the HTML file for the requested Web page preferably includes a content classification or affinity rating for each content component on the Web page that is subject to personalization. An HTML file profiler parses each HTML file to extract the constituent components, and analyzes and assigns ratings to the content components. (emphasis added)

As described in paragraph 0043, Hosea's HTML profile classifies content in the Web pages in the same manner as does the user profile (see paragraph 0041, which describes assigning numerical ratings to elements of Web content). The format components, which the Office Action equates to style, is merely the HTML mark-up code (see paragraph 0043 above).

Thus, Hosea does not describe scanning mark-up code and attributes associated with components defined in the mark-up code in order to obtain information relating to a style of a source page. Instead, Hosea's HTML profile uses the mark-up code to identify content, and then ranks the content. Furthermore, as correctly noted in the Office Action, Hosea does not generate a content component that is to be included in a source page by formatting the content component in accordance with a profile so that the style of the content component comports substantially to a style of the source page. Borger was cited to make up for this deficiency of Hosea.

Borger describes a process in which a first server requests content from a second server that is to be inserted into a first Web page generated by the first server. The point in the first Web page at which the content is to be inserted includes markup tags (see, e.g., paragraph 0046). As described in paragraph 0059 of Borger:

In response to receiving the request for the first content portion, the second server selects a first content portion having a format specified by the first markup tag(s) (Block 220). If a first content portion does not have a format specified by the first markup tag(s), a first content portion may be transcoded to the format specified by the first markup tag(s) (Block 230). Transcoding may be performed by the second server or by a data processing system in communication with the second server, as would be understood by one of skill in the art.

Thus, while Borger does describe changing (transcoding) a format of content from the second server, Borger does so on an element-by-element basis. That is, in Borger, the format is dictated by markup tags that are located at a point of content insertion. A profile is not used, much less a profile that contains information relating to a style of a source page as a whole.

The Office Action states that a combination of Borger and Hosea would render the claims obvious because, e.g., "the format of the content component [of Borger] is derived from the format of the web document and should not be much different from the format of the web

document". Applicants respectfully disagree with this logic, at least insofar as it could be applied to the amended claims. More specifically, while it is true that format of Borger's content component is derived from a Web page, the format is element-specific. That is, the format does not relate to the page as a whole, nor does it take into account information from attributes of elements on the page. Accordingly, even if Borger's markup information were incorporated into the Hosea profile, the resulting hypothetical combination would, at best, include a profile that identified rankings of Web page components and that identified markup tags of individual components. The profile would not relate to the style of the page as a whole.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Borger and Hosea. The remaining applied art is also not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentable.

Amended independent claims 24 and 29 are media and apparatus claims, respectively, that roughly correspond to claim 1. These claims are also believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Each of the dependent claims is also believed to define patentable features of the invention. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been addressed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as

Applicants : Donald M. Kosak, et al.  
Serial No. : 09/803,540  
Filed : March 9, 2001  
Page : 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-535001  
Client Ref.: P257

an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-521-7896.

If any additional fees are due including, but not limited to, claims fees and extension fees, please charge them to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 10984-535001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 11, 2006



Paul A. Pysher  
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906